

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 9, 10, 12, 13 and 15 have been amended. Claim 4 has been cancelled. Claims 1-3, 5-7 and 9-15 remain pending in the present application. Basis for the amendments can be found through the specification, drawings and claims as originally filed.

### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112, SECOND PARAGRAPH**

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-7 and 9-15 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, alleging them to be indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In Claim 1, the Examiner alleges that language in lines 11-13 is confusing and contradictory to lines 6-10. Applicants have deleted the language in lines 11-13 and now believes Claim 1 to overcome the Examiner's 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph rejection. Additionally, the Examiner indicates that this same error occurs in Claim 6, 9, 12, 13 and 15. Accordingly, these claims have likewise been amended to delete the language in lines 11-13. Accordingly, Applicants believe these claims to overcome the Examiner's 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph rejection.

Applicants have amended Claim 2 to further define that the chamber is formed between the recess in the housing and the single thickness of the sheet. Accordingly, Applicants believe this change to overcome the Examiner's 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph rejection and respectfully request withdrawal of the same.

Claim 4 has been cancelled. Accordingly, Applicant believes the Examiner's rejection to be moot.

Claim 5 has been amended to further define that the gripping portion further comprises a gaseous dampening vibration material in the chamber and that the gaseous vibration dampening material is air. Accordingly, Applicant believes Claim 5 to overcome the Examiner's 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, rejection and respectfully request withdrawal of the same.

The Examiner has rejected Claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Claim 10 has been amended to further define two additional chambers. Two chambers are disposed on each of the gripping portions. Also, the chambers are discreet from one another. Accordingly, Applicants believes Claim 10 to overcome the Examiner's 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, rejection and respectfully request withdrawal of the same.

The Examiner has indicated that all claims, Claims 1-3 and 5-7 and 9-15 are allowable over the art of record. Applicants believe the above amendments to overcome the Examiner's rejection and respectfully request withdrawal of the same.

In light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to pass the case to issue at his earliest possible convenience.

Should the Examiner have any questions regarding the present application, he should not hesitate to contact the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 12, 2008

By: 

W. R. Duke Taylor  
Reg. No. 31,366

HARNES, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

WRDT/lkj